



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,415	02/25/2002	Hongyi Zhou	CU-2844 RJS	3274

26530 7590 09/21/2005

LADAS & PARRY LLP  
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/069,415

Applicant(s)

ZHOU, HONGYI

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/29/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the Response to Election/Restriction filed 22 August 2005.
2. Group I, Claims 1-11, 18, and 19, as Elected by applicant, have been examined. Claims 12-17 have been withdrawn from consideration.

#### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
4. The offending hyperlinks can be found on page 2 of the specification on lines 20 (<http://www.realnames.com>) and 27 (<http://www.netword.com>), on page 7, line 9 (<http://www.microsoft.com>), and also on page 4, line 34 (<http://www.letscard.com>).

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1, 8, and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: On line 13 of claim 1 a spelling error is present: "natual" should be changed to "natural". On line 1 of claim 8 a spelling error is present: "natual" should be changed to "natural". On line 13 of claim 18 a spelling error is present: "natual" should be changed to "natural". Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 4, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
8. Claim 4 recites the limitation "the specified rules" in 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
9. Claim 7 recites the limitation "the specified rules" in line 3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
10. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the above rules" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination proceedings, "the above rules" are interpreted as being "the specified rules" recited in claim 10.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. Claims 1 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tout (U.S. 6,182,148).
13. Regarding claim 1, Tout discloses a method of intelligent information processing in the Internet comprising:

- a) identifying whether an input is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33);
  - b) if the input is a regular URL, querying the input in a corresponding server through the Internet, and directly obtaining the query result therefrom (col. 3, lines 53-59 and col. 5, lines 18-33);
  - c) if the input includes the native language pronunciation notations, parsing the input against at least one phonetic spelling word list to find out corresponding Internet keyword, and then fetching a corresponding query result (col. 5, lines 18-33); and
  - d) if the input includes characters of a native language, processing the input as a natural language input in a natural language table, and obtaining a desired Internet keyword, and fetching a corresponding query result of website URL (col. 5, lines 18-33).
14. Regarding claim 18, Tout discloses a system of intelligent information processing in the Internet comprising:
- means for inputting a query string of words (col. 5, lines 18-33);
  - means for identifying whether an input of words is one of a URL address, English words, native language characters, and native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for querying the input in a corresponding server through the Internet, and directly obtaining the query result therefrom if the input is a regular URL (col. 5, lines 18-33);

means for parsing the input against at least one phonetic spelling word list to find out corresponding Internet keyword, and then fetching a corresponding query result if the input includes the native language pronunciation notations (col. 5, lines 18-33); and

means for processing the input as a natural language input in a natural language table, and obtaining a desired Internet keyword, and fetching a corresponding query result of website URL if the input includes characters of a native language (col. 5, lines 18-33).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tout in view of Maruyama et al. (U.S. 5,835,924), hereinafter referred to as Maruyama.

17. Regarding claim 2, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, the steps being the determination of

whether the notations are full phonetic spelling words or abbreviations of phonetic spelling words. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

18. Regarding claim 3, as stated above for claim 2, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations in order to obtain Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List and splitting the query string into one or more Chinese phonetic spelling words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 3.

19. Regarding claim 5, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, the steps being the determination of whether the notations are full phonetic spelling words or abbreviations of phonetic spelling words. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 5, lines 53-62, col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an abbreviated input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 5.

20. Regarding claim 6, as stated above for claim 5, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations in order to obtain Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Full Chinese Pinyin Words List and splitting the query string into one or



more abbreviated Chinese phonetic spelling words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using a Pinyin words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 6.

21. Regarding claim 8, Tout discloses the use of table and the determination of Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the table being a natural language table and parsing the input and using the table to determine Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

22. Regarding claim 9, as stated above for claim 8, Tout discloses the use of table and the determination of Internet keywords (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of processing, these steps being the method of parsing the query string against a Chinese English Words List and splitting the query string into one or more Chinese words and using further processing methods to find Internet keywords. However, Maruyama discloses language processing wherein the query is split up (col. 3, lines 38-40), and each portion is parsed using an English words list (col. 3, lines 41-52). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. The rationale used for motivation in the combination for claim 8 applies equally as well to claim 9.

23. Regarding claim 19, Tout discloses the method of processing native language characters and pronunciations (see col. 5, lines 18-33), but does not explicitly state the method used to perform the steps of performing spelling error checks and automatically providing corrections to spelling errors. However, Maruyama discloses language processing of both full and abbreviated words (see col. 7, lines 53-61 and col. 8, lines 15-31) and also the method of parsing an input string using a Chinese phonetic spelling word by using a dictionary in order to provide proper spelling of Chinese phonetically spelled words (see col. 4, lines 34-45 and col. 7, lines 44-48). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to utilize the method disclosed by Maruyama to parse the input string using a dictionary in

Art Unit: 2142

combination with the language processing method disclosed by Tout. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination because Tout's invention is intended to be used for many languages when handling domain queries, in this instance, one would be motivated to use the method disclosed by Maruyama in order to handle input queries submitted in Chinese (see Tout, col. 4, lines 18-30 and Maruyama, col. 1, lines 8-15).

24. Claims 4, 7, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tout and Maruyama in view of Bates et al. (U.S. 6,873,982), hereinafter referred to as Bates.

25. Regarding claim 4, 7, 10, 11, the combination of Tout and Maruyama disclose an environment wherein internet keywords are received in a group, but does not explicitly disclose a method for creating rules and assigning weights to keywords in order to provide a results lists that is sorted based on rules in conjunction with assigned weights. However, Bates discloses an ordering of database search results wherein the search results are ordered based on rules specifically set which sort the results based on assigned weights to the search results (col. 14, lines 6-32). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicants invention would have found it obvious to implement a sorting method for a results list based on weights assigned to keywords in a database searching routine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to implement the sorting function disclosed by Bates as explained above in combination with the environment provided by the combination of Tout and Maruyama because, as disclosed by Bates, it is well known and desirable when providing a search results list to

be able to provide to a user ordered search results with the most relevant items provided to the user at the top of the list (see Bates, col. 2, lines 29-39).

### ***Conclusion***

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tan et al. (U.S. 6,314,469) disclose a multi-language domain name service.

Chang et al. (U.S. 6,167,367) disclose a method and device for automatic error detection and correction for computerized text files.

Chen (U.S. 6,014,615) discloses a system and method for processing morphological and syntactical analyses of inputted Chinese language phrases.

Walfish et al. (U.S. 6,047,300) disclose a system and method for automatically correcting a misspelled word.

Moser et al. (U.S. 6,275,789) disclose a method and apparatus for performing full bidirectional translation between a source language and a linked alternative language.

Voit (U.S. 6,104,711) discloses an enhanced internet domain name translation server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

baa

*Beatriz Prieto*  
**BEATRIZ PRIETO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**